



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,884	05/21/2001	Kenneth L. Davis	30566.128-US-01	6589

22462 7590 06/02/2005

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/862,884

Applicant(s)

DAVIS, KENNETH L.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: amendment filed 18 November 2004 with recognition of an original filing date of, 21 May 2001.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending. Applicant amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17.
Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Response to Argument

3. Applicant's Amendment and arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Independent claims 1, 9 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Covington et al. US005524193A - filed- 2 September 1994(hereinafter Covington), in view of Ubillos US005999173A – filed- 03 April 1992 (hereinafter Ubillos).

As to independent claim 1, (a) obtaining a sequence of frames to be consecutively displayed on a display device, wherein a frame comprises one or more images (as taught by Covington at col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 5, i.e. video clip may be referred to a “media event” and display under any topic of the computer base as video segment display), also at col. 5, lines 25-30 (i.e. display on a color monitor), **(b) obtaining annotation information, wherein the annotation information comprises: (ii) an annotation** (as taught by Covington at col. 4, lines 40-45 (i.e. annotated with text, video with a trigger (an annotation)); **(i) an identification of a frame; and (iii) a location on the identified frame to display the annotation** (as taught by Covington at col. 9, line 50 through col. 10; line 30, i.e. that is a piece of each reel is divided into a number of different partitions, call “frames”, illustrating in FIG. 5, each of the Library reel, Clip Reel, and Event Reel are divided into six frames, if the event is graphic event , utilizing the bitmap, vector map. The Library, Clip and Event Reels, respectively, provide a means for identifying and selecting individual or groups of events from among the thousands that may be available, for inspecting them, modifying them or creating new events, and for assembling a sequence of events that may be connected to a trigger) may be referred to a “media event” to display under any topic of the computer base, such as video segment display), **(c) consecutively displaying one or more of the sequence of frames** (as taught by Covington at col. 5, lines , disclosed the sequence that is displayed when the same trigger is activated);

Covington does not explicitly teach, **(d) determining when the identified frame is displayed**, however (as taught by Ubillos at col. 2 lines 35 - 60, Ubillos disclosed a video editing method, wherein the selected clips are displaying on every Nth frame in accordance with user selected time compression factor), **and automatically pausing the display of the sequence of**

frames at the identified frame, however (as described by Ubillos at col. 3 lines 20- 30, in another embodiment, Ubillos provide a preview defined by clips displayed in a desired sequence along a time ruler of a construction window by retrieving the clips from memory, processing the retrieved clips , and sequentially displaying the processed clips as a preview in a separate video window. The schema used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed, wherein the clips displayed in a desired sequence along a time ruler of a construction window by retrieving the clips from memory is interpretation equivalent to automatically pausing the display of the sequence of frames at the identified frame); **(e) displaying the annotation at the location on the identified frame**, however (as taught by Ubillos at col. 2 lines 35 - 60, Ubillos disclosed a video editing method, wherein the selected clips are displaying on every Nth frame in accordance with user selected time compression factor); **(f) continue displaying the sequence of frames subsequent to the identified frame when a user elects to proceed**, however (as taught by Ubillos at col. 3, lines 35-40, Ubillos disclosed a video editing method, wherein process one or more selected video clips by filtering the corresponding digital video data with a temporally varying mosaic filter (having user-selected time-varying filter characteristics. The schema used here in the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed, wherein more selected video clips displayed in a desired sequence along a time ruler of a construction window by retrieving the clips from memory is interpretation equivalent to continue displaying the sequence of frames subsequent to the identified frame when a user elects to proceed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Covington, provided an interactive multimedia annotation method and apparatus, to include a means of determining when

displaying the annotation at the location on the identified frame is displayed at the identified frame and automatically pausing the display of the sequence of frames at the identified frame and continue displaying the sequence of frames subsequent to the identified frame when a user elects to proceed as taught by Ubillos. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for enabling user to annotating between consecutive video segments (as taught by Ubillos at col. 2, lines 1-10).

As to independent claims 9 and 17, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

6. **Dependent claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 16, 18-22 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Covington et al. US005524193A - filed- 2 September 1994(hereinafter Covington), in view of Ubillos US005999173A – filed- 03 April 1992 (hereinafter Ubillos).

As to dependent claim 2, the annotation comprises text (as taught by Covington at col. 4, lines 40-45 (i.e. annotated with text).

As to dependent claim 3, the annotation comprises an arrow (as taught by Covington at col. 4, lines 50-65 (i.e. two arrow buttons).

As to dependent claim 4, the annotation comprises a primitive shape (as taught by Covington at col. 16, lines 1-5 (i.e. the graphics editor shown in FIG. 11 does not provide for changing the graphic bitmap shown in display area 1110. It only allows the bitmap to be incorporated in the graphic event being created as a whole).

As to dependent claim 5, the sequence of frames comprises an animation (as taught by Covington at col. 1, lines 30-35 (i.e. either still or animated).

As to dependent claim 6, the sequence of frames comprises a video, however (as taught by Ubillos at col. 5, lines 35-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Covington, provided an interactive multimedia annotation method and apparatus, to include a means of video editing, in which video clips (and optionally also still image clips and audio clips) are stored as digital data in a computer memory, selected clips are displayed in elongated windows (known as "tracks") on a display screen of Ubillos' teaching. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification for enabling user to annotating between consecutive video segments (as taught by Ubillos at col. 2, lines 1-10).

As to dependent claims 8, 16 and 24, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 10-14 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim claims 2-6 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 18-22 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 2-6 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

7. **Dependent claims 7, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) unpatentable by Covington et al. US005524193A - filed- 2 September 1994 (hereinafter Covington), in view of**

Ubillos US005999173A – filed- 03 April 1992 (hereinafter Ubillos), in view of Gupta et al.

UUS006484156B1- filed- 15 September 1999 (hereinafter Gupta).

A to dependent claim 7, Covington and Ubillos do not explicitly teach, **the annotation information is defined in conformance with an extensible markup language (XML) schema**, however, (as taught by Gupta at col. 6, lines 5-15, i.e. an annotation server and a client computer using Extensible Markup Language (XML)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Covington, provided an interactive multimedia annotation method and apparatus, to include a means of determining when displaying the annotation at the location on the identified frame is displayed at the identified frame and automatically pausing the display of the sequence of frames at the identified frame and continue displaying the sequence of frames subsequent to the identified frame when a user elects to proceed as taught by Ubillos, to include a means of annotations information is defined in conformance with an extensible markup language (XML). One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to synchronize the media composition frameworks implied by MPEG-4, Dynamic HTML, other media playback environments, multimedia presentation may also include “annotation” in the HTML environment (as taught by Gupta at col. 1, lines 35-65).

In regard to dependent claim 15, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 23, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
May 30, 2005